UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/514,657	02/29/2000	Anders Waesterlid	P-4015.321	2064

7590   02/10/2003

David E Bennett
Coats & Bennett PLLC
PO Box 5
Raleigh, NC 27602

EXAMINER
D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2684	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/514,657	WAESTERLID, ANDERS
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen M. D'Agosta	2684	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
      NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☒ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: *1-8 and 10-25*.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____.

WILLIAM CUMMING
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. Borgstahl (pg. 5, L5-7) teaches full duplex communication between peers. Said peers can be virtually any device (pg. 8, L8-30) which would lead one skilled in the art to understand that data transmitted between the peers is "status data" about the other peers (ie. POS, ATM or other electronic devices would transmit pertinent data about the machine to the peer to allow the peer to inter-operate with the POS, ATM, etc.). Rosenberg ALSO teaches all peers/terminals can send/receive data/updates as well. The memory disclosed by Borgstahl would be used to store said status data. Lastly, since Borgstahl/Rosenberg infer that the terminals are computers, one skilled in the art realizes that many different computer programs would be hosted on said computer which can require status data from other terminals (Note that Rosenberg discloses event notification and keys off a log-on event with is consistent with affinity group software such as Chat, ICQ, Microsoft ILS, etc. which perform updates to others - a user logs on, to a Chat server for example, and the user's affinity group information is disseminated to the others in the group informing them that the user has just logged in and is now on-line. Many other examples exist as well.). 2. With regard to Rosenberg "server" computers, computers today can be operated both as clients and servers, hence the applicant is mistaken that Rosenberg's invention can only be operated on server computers. The use of a "central server" is consistent with typical designs but there is nothing that would inhibit operation of Rosenberg's invention if the "server" was a "user/peer" and can be locatable via the networ (via TCP/IP Address, for example) 3. The (correctly) stated motivation for the 103 rejection is that the computer networks described DO send various data messages amongst themselves - which would include status messages as described by the applicant.